UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/565,976 | 04/28/2006 | Thomas Rueckle | 283829US0PCT | 9518 |
| 22850 7590 04/19/2010 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314 | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | HAVLIN, ROBERT H | |
| ALEAANDRIA, VA 22314 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1626 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 04/19/2010 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|--|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | 10/565,976 | RUECKLE ET AL. |
| Examiner initiated interview duminary | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | ROBERT HAVLIN | 1626 |
| All Participants: | Status of Application: <u>afte</u> | <u>er final</u> |
| (1) <u>ROBERT HAVLIN</u> . | (3) | |
| (2) <u>Daniel Pereira</u> . | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: <u>13 April 2010</u> | Time: | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: . | ant's representative) | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: 102(e) rejection in Final Office Action dated 4/28/09 | | |
| Claims discussed: 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 11, 21 | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: Hasegawa et al. | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE In response to Applicant's filed appeal brief, the Examiner conta for "unsubstituted" elements in the claims would be an acceptable that this was acceptable and planned to file an RCE with amend | acted applicant to inquire whether a ple means of resolving the 102(e) re | mending the claims to provide |
| Part III. | | |
| It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa | ne examiner will provide a written record of the substance of the | en summary of the substance interview, since the interview |
| | | |
| /Robert Havlin/ Examiner, Art Unit 1626 | Applicant/Applicant's Representat | ive Signature – if appropriate) |